

**BUTTE COUNTY
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES COMMISSION
Friday, April 16, 2004
Special Meeting Minutes**

Held at the Mira Loma Drive county offices, the meeting was called to order at 8:33 a.m.

Item 1: Introductions and Agenda Review

Commissioners present: Mark Lundberg, Sandra Machida, Karen Marlatt, Linda Moore, Gene Smith Alternates: Jeff Fontana, Mary Neumann

Commissioners absent: Pat Cragar, Jane Dolan, Marian Gage, and Phyllis Murdock

Staff present: Susan Billings, Anna Dove, and Bobbi Dunivan

Staff absent: Cheryl Giscombe and Eva Puciata

Also present were: Aimee Myles/Public Health, Brian Whitlow/Biggs-Gridley Memorial Hospital, Kim Young/St Thomas More, Cindy Wolff/OPT For Fit Kids, Kristin Gruneisen/OPT For Fit Kids, Harold Baize/Behavioral Health, Carmen Ochoa/Public Health, Eric Sawtelle/Public Health, Vicki Shively/Northern Valley Indian Health, Dana Campbell/Parent Education Network, Connie Carter/DA, Kris Simpson/DA, and others who arrived later.

This meeting was held pursuant to the requirements of Butte County Children and Families Commission Policy Number 03-004A, Protest of RFP, RFA, & RFQ Denials. The Commission received thirty proposals for funding for the 2004 funding cycle. During the initial evaluation process, twelve proposals were rejected for non-compliance. Eight Protests of Denial were received.

Mark Lundberg suggested setting a fifteen-minute time limit for each presentation of appeal, though Commission discussions could go longer. He also suggested focusing discussions on the process, rather than merit. As all thirty proposals have merit, it would be unfair to allow some proposers to discuss the merits of their proposal without offering the opportunity to all. Commissioners agreed with Mark's suggestions.

Item 2: Contract Award Committee Report and Recommendations

The Contract Awards Committee met twice following the deadline for Protests of Denial to review protests and make recommendations to the full Commission.

- (A) The Committee discussed *by control number only* the level of deficiency of each proposal. It was recommended, based on common deficiencies, to include in the reading process proposals that did not include a start-up form or check N/A (criteria #7) based on perceived ambiguity. Those application control numbers were 020, 021, and 028.
- (B) It was recommended that those proposals that were screened for the same deficiencies as (A), but the proposers did not submit a Request For Protest also be included in the reading process. Those application control numbers were 004 and 012.

Gene Smith made a motion to include proposal numbers 004, 012, 020, 021 and 028 in the reading and scoring process without further hearing. Sandra Machida seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

- (C) The Committee recommended that the remaining Request For Protests be reviewed and discussed individually by the full Commission on April 16, 2004. Jeff Fontana expressed his hopes that all of the proposals would be allowed to move forward in the reading process. In looking at the role of the Commission in the community, our job is to mentor the community to achieve its maximum potential. It

is important to be respectful of laws and regulations, but just as important to keep sight of what we are trying to accomplish. The RFP process has been a learning experience for all involved, but none of the RFP errors were fatal. Jeff suggested that the Commission forego the appeal presentations and allow all of the proposals to be read and scored. Linda Moore shared her concerns that it might be unfair to the proposers who submitted error-free proposals not to listen to appeals. Sandra Machida noted that she would prefer to read all proposals and score them accordingly, errors and all. It was the consensus of the Commissioners to forego the appeal presentations.

- (D) The Committee recommended that several changes be made in the RFP documents for the next funding cycle. Suggested changes included changing the checklist instructions to "Failure to include any of these items will be cause for rejection", removing the phrase "if applicable" from the start-up funds item (criteria #7), inserting the statement "Incomplete applications will not be read" at the top and the bottom of the checklist, and inserting the phrase "This checklist must be attached to the application" above the required signature line. Linda Moore suggested including the phrase "proposals will be screened out of the process for non-compliance".

Suggestions made by the Committee and Linda Moore were not motioned on, but will serve as valuable suggestions for the next funding cycle.

Item 3: Public Hearing Protest of RFP, RFA & RFQ Denials

Mary Neumann recused herself from the following motion.

Linda Moore made a motion to include application control number 04-026 in the reading process. Sandra Machida seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

Karen Marlatt recused herself from the following motion.

Jeff Fontana made a motion to include application control numbers 04-008, 04-013, 04-015, 04-017, 04-018 and 04-022 in the reading process. Sandra Machida seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention.

Bobbi Dunivan confirmed that she would be sending letters to reinstated proposers and hand delivering copies of the proposals to readers. The reading process was extended to April 30, 2004 to allow time to read and score all thirty proposals.

Public Comment

Members of the public thanked the Commissioners for their efforts thus far and voiced appreciation for the opportunity to continue in the process.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 A.M.

Minutes by Susan Billings
Administrative Assistant